DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 399 602 CS 509 352

AUTHOR Lueck, Therese L.; And Others
TITLE How Women Are Faring as the Dust Settles: The Effect of Gender on Journalism/Mass Communication Evaluations in a Communication Context.
PUB DATE Aug 96
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (79th, Anaheim, CA, August 9-13, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Analysis of Variance; Communication Research; Higher Education; Questionnaires; Sex Differences; *Sex Role; *Student Attitudes; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Student Surveys; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Gender Issues; *Student Perceptions of Teacher

ABSTRACT

A study examined the difference and effects of sex and sex-role on course evaluations of journalism/mass communication instructors at a midwestern university that had recently consolidated its school of communication and its journalism/mass communication courses. Subjects, students in 18 communication or journalism/mass communication classes taught by 9 full-time instructors, completed a questionnaire. Both standardized evaluations and the indexes of culturally desirable gender traits showed high ranking for women instructors. Instructors were not matched for variables such as experience. Interaction effects between same-sex instructors and students were not found; however 2-way interactions between instructor sex and type of course were observed. Further research in gender-based evaluation is called for. (Contains 41 references and 7 tables of data.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 399 602

HOW WOMEN ARE FARING AS THE DUST SETTLES:

THE EFFECT OF GENDER ON JOURNALISM/MASS COMMUNICATION

EVALUATIONS IN A COMMUNICATION CONTEXT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Prepared by:

Therese L. Lueck
Associate Professor

Richard E. Caplan
Associate Professor

Kathleen L. Endres
Professor

School of Communication
The University of Akron
Akron, OH 44325-1003
Ph: 330-972-7954
FAX: 330-972-8045

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T. Lueck
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Commission on the Status of Women
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication
1996

CS505352

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HOW WOMEN ARE FARING AS THE DUST SETTLES: THE EFFECT OF GENDER ON JOURNALISM/MASS COMMUNICATION EVALUATIONS IN A COMMUNICATION CONTEXT

Abstract

Researchers tested course evaluation results for journalism/mass communication at a midwestern university's school of communication. Both standardized evaluations and the indexes of culturally desirable gender traits showed high ranking for women instructors. Instructors were not matched for variables such as experience. Interaction effects between same-sex instructors and students were not found; however two-way interactions between instructor sex and type of course were observed.

How Women Are Faring as the Dust Settles: The Effect of Gender on Journalism/Mass Communication Evaluations in a Communication Context

Introduction

Student evaluations of faculty teaching constitute a widely accepted method of assessing courses and the quality of teaching in higher education. Although they are relied upon for personnel and merit decisions, much controversy continues to surround the student teaching evaluation as a measurement of teaching effectiveness.

Much of this controversy centers on potential bias, with important aspects being the effect of sex and sex-role perceptions. This study was designed to investigate the effect of these variables on course evaluations. It is the contention of these researchers that students have reactions and expectations of instructors based on the sex of the instructor and, additionally, that student expectations for journalism/mass communication instructors may be conditioned by a communication context. Researchers attempted to chart potential for student perceptions to bias an instrument otherwise presumed to be an objective measure of teaching effectiveness.

Amid a climate of consolidation of academic programs, evaluations take on a heightened significance. With this consolidation often placing them into communication departments, journalism and mass communication instructors must become aware of how they are being evaluated. In umbrella communication departments, journalism/mass communication instructors and their coursework may exist under the aegis of policies designed for and procedures

established in a broadly based communication environment. This situation has far-reaching implications not only for evaluations but for resources, salaries, policy-driven decisions, potentially course content and ultimately the fit and value of journalism/mass communication courses and instructors. In this environment of consolidation, women, as relative new-comers to the journalism/mass communication faculty, particularly need to be wary of the tools used to assess such information, what they measure and how they are used.

To gauge difference and effects of sex and sex-role on course evaluations of journalism/mass communication instructors in this communication context, researchers conducted their naturalistic study at a midwestern university at which the dust has settled: Its journalism and mass communication courses are taught from within the umbrella communication department.

Literature Review

Higher education in the United States in the latter 1990s exists in a climate of economically driven and legislatively managed consolidations. Within this context, journalism/mass communication courses and programs have been merged with broadly based schools of communication. In these situations, women have generally maintained optimism. For instance, when the Ohio State University proposed the journalism-communication merger, Pamela Shoemaker, then-director of the school of journalism, stated that when the dust settled, the school would probably offer fewer journalism courses but that the students would have more flexibility in structuring their programs of study (Magill, 1994, p. 21). Journalism/mass communication professionals have been watching this merger phenomenon closely. As

her two predecessors, Shoemaker, current president of the Association for Education in Journalism & Mass Communication, monitors the situation. In retaining her optimism, she explores alliances and umbrella organizations on the professional educators' level (Shoemaker, 1996, p. 2). With increasing consolidations, journalism/mass communication educators will have more interaction with and within speech-driven communication organizations. How journalism/mass communication educators fit with these organizations may be a reflection of how they are evaluated and valued at the school level that integrates journalism/mass communication with communication.

Teaching performance is an important part of this fit, and it remains an important consideration in retention, tenure, promotion and merit decisions. How to measure and evaluate teaching effectiveness has long been debated in a variety of disciplines (Cashin, 1988; Arreola, 1989). According to a survey of 453 department heads (Centra, 1977), the chair's evaluation had the greatest weight in determining teaching effectiveness. Tied for second were colleagues' opinions and systematic student ratings.

Of these three, student ratings are often accepted without thought of factors apart from teaching performance that might influence student responses. Research has explored any number of variables affecting the ratings (Feldman, 1983; Feldman, 1986; Marsh, 1984; Marsh and Ware, 1982).

Sex and sex-role have been among the factors examined in determining if student ratings are valid measures of teaching performance. Validity here is defined: "Does the test measure what it

is supposed to?" (Cashin, 1988). In the course of research, questions of bias have surfaced (Swim, Borgida, Maruyama & Myers, 1989), or factors that negatively or positively have an impact on the results of the instrument (see Marsh, 1984, pp. 707-754). While the research is not conclusive, a large number of studies have found that the sex of the instructor may influence ratings.

For purposes of this study, researchers relied upon definitions from Basow (1992): "Sex is a biological term; people are termed either male or female depending on their sex organs and genes. In contrast, gender is a psychological and culture term [referring] to society's evaluation of behavior as masculine or feminine" (p. 2). Basow, in quoting from Ashmore & Del Boca (1979, p. 222), explains that the term gender, or sex-role, stereotype refers to "those structured sets of beliefs about the personal attributes of women and men" (p. 3). She also pointed out, "[S]ocial desirability of masculine and feminine traits is related to gender stereotyping" (pp. 6-7).

Sex and gender have been studied as variables that make a difference in the evaluation process. Many studies have found male instructors rated higher than women teachers. Kierstead, D'Agostino and Dill (1988), for example, found that both male and female students consistently rated their female instructor lower than the male teacher; the respondents of both sexes expected female instructors to fulfill a different standard of behavior than their male teachers. "If female instructors want to obtain high student ratings, they must be not only highly competent with regard to factors directly related to teaching but also careful to act in accordance with traditional sex role expectations," the researchers explained. "In

particular, our results indicated that male and female instructors will earn equal SRIs [Student Rating Instruments] for equal professional work only if the women also display stereotypically feminine behavior" (pp. 342-344). This negative rating of female instructors by students of both sexes tended to support earlier studies (e.g., Lombardo & Tocci, 1979; Wilson & Wilson, 1976).

Other studies have found that the male students rated female instructors in a more harsh way than the male teachers. Bernard, Keefauver, Elsworth and Naylor (1981) used an experimental design to test female and male student responses to teachers. In that study, the researchers found that male students were significantly less positive in their attitudes, expectations and evaluations of female teachers than female students, and the male students consistently rated male instructors more favorably than they did the female instructors.

That finding was reinforced by Basow and Silberg (1987). In a study of more than 1,000 college students of 16 male and female professors (matched for course, teaching experience and tenure), male students gave female professors significantly poorer ratings than they gave the male instructors for each of six variables. Female students rated the female professor more negatively than male teachers on only three variables. Findings, especially in naturalistic settings, are complex. When variables such as experience and tenure are not controlled for women tend to be ranked higher than men (Feldman, 1993).

According to this literature, when variables such as experience are controlled for, women instructors are likely to be at a disadvantage. Certain studies have emphasized that women instructors

are expected to behave in a certain manner consistent with social expectations. Other studies have pointed out that the teaching function at the higher education level may run counter to gender expectations. Rakow (1991) pointed out that women who teach on the college level transgress their traditional gender role designations, assuming instead a non-traditional role, a violation of the "natural" order or authority. This hostile effect can be somewhat mediated by the students' continued experiences with women in non-traditional roles such as university professor (Fandt & Stevens, 1991).

Another body of research examines how societal expectations of gender affect students. According to this body of research, students come to expect certain behaviors from their female and male instructors. Findings suggest that students expect certain gender-stereotypical behavior from their instructors. Female teachers are expected to conform to culturally accepted behaviors, and those who fail to conform to those stereotypes often find negative student ratings. "Nurturing" and a close interpersonal relationship with students fall within this cultural expectation.

Bennett's study (1982) of 253 students illustrates such research. Bennett found that women instructors were perceived as warmer (a highly loaded female characteristic [Bem, 1981]) within the classroom. Yet students demanded a greater amount of interpersonal support and held women to a stricter standard of accessibility. While Bennett did not detect any direct gender biases in the formal student evaluations, she speculated that female faculty members were subject to "cultural conditioned gender stereotypes" (pp. 170-179).

That expectation for a higher degree of interpersonal contact from female instructors was also found by Cooper, Stewart and Gudykunst (1982) in their study. Interpersonal contact as a variable had far more importance in the students' judgment of female instructors than male instructors. "[W]omen are caring and sensitive while men are competent," the authors concluded, pointing to the stereotypes. "When evaluating instructors, students give greater significance to the type of interpersonal responses they receive from female instructors while giving greater significance to the accuracy of the grade they receive from male instructors" (pp. 308-315).

These findings, however, remain controversial when placed in the context of mixed research results. Other studies have not shown that culturally conditioned gender stereotypes affect student evaluations. Bennett (1982) did not detect direct biases, although she detected differing student expectations of instructors, depending on gender. An early study by Elmore and LaPointe (1974) detected no interaction between the faculty member and the student based on sex and no differences between the mean ratings given male and female faculty by students. Yet, these researchers emphasized that they did not control for many variables in their study, such as class size and instructor's rank.

Recent research has indicated an interaction effect between same-sex instructors and students. The researchers (1993) found an interaction effect in journalism/mass communication courses at a midwestern university. Basow (1995) also detected interaction effects -- across the curriculum -- in her four-year study of a private liberal arts college. She found teacher gender by student gender interaction

describing same-gender preference. What she also found was a teacher gender by course division interaction, with female teachers in humanities rated similarly or slightly higher than male instructors, female instructors in natural sciences rated slightly lower than male teachers, and mixed results in the social sciences. She detected the three-way interaction of teacher gender by student gender by division.

The conflicting nature of the research results has led Cashin of the Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development to conclude in 1988 that gender of instructor did not appear to be a factor in student evaluations. Yet two years later, while still noting that gender showed "little or no correlation" in student evaluations, Cashin (1990) wrote, "[I]f the instructor provides evidence of his or her self-report of these variables [including gender], or if you or others have such evidence, that evidence should be taken into consideration."

Much of the gender research has relied on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) to measure socially desirable masculine and feminine traits. The BSRI is based on extensive examination of culturally defined masculine and feminine characteristics (Bem, 1981). For instance, based on two decades of testing, Bem has found that an item, or behavioral characteristic, such as that defined by the phrase "demonstrates leadership abilities" is highly loaded as a culturally desirable masculine trait. Similarly, the phrase "eager to soothe hurt feelings" was found through equally extensive testing to be a highly loaded item designating a culturally desirable feminine characteristic. The BSRI has found its use across the curriculum. Studies have verified the reliability and the internal consistency of the BSRI. Yanico (1985) showed that the BSRI has at least a moderate long-term

reliability. Schmitt and Millard (1988) found that while not all individuals can be shown to respond to sex-type coding, which the BSRI endeavors to chart, people do tend to use culturally defined standards of masculinity and femininity as yardsticks. Basow (1992) pointed out that the BSRI reveals the fallacy of stereotypically masculine and stereotypically feminine characteristics being considered polar opposites. She noted that there has not necessarily been an inverse relationship between how one scores on the stereotypically masculine and how one scores on the stereotypically feminine characteristics. "How high someone scores on masculinity is unrelated to how high he or she scores on femininity" (p. 7).

A study by Martin and Ramanaiah (1988) found that the more recent Bem short form (the basis for the current study) is a better indicator of the culturally defined standards of masculinity and femininity than the earlier form. A thorough review by Spence (1991) showed that the BSRI measures broader concepts, that it has construct validity and that the newer short form eliminates the problems of the earlier longer form. Bem's inventory remains an often utilized instrument in such research (Freeman, 1994; Stimpson, Neff, Jensen & Newby, 1991). Even when researchers develop their own instruments, Bem is often the basis for these new instruments (e.g., Street, Kromrey & Kimmel, 1995).

In their previous studies (Lueck, Caplan & Endres, 1994; Lueck, Endres & Caplan, 1993) the researchers developed a 15-item instrument to chart gender stereotypes in the journalism/mass communication classroom. To gauge student perceptions of desirable masculine and desirable feminine traits, five masculine statements and

five feminine statements were used. An instrument was formed from the pool of the highest loaded BSRI items for masculinity and highest loaded BSRI items for femininity from the Bem short form. Statements from a pre-existing departmental evaluation form were used as filler questions, which are typically used in studies employing the BSRI. The items selected from Bem's short form were not only from the pool of highest loaded masculine and feminine characteristics but also those with potential for application to the journalism/mass communication classroom. For example, one highly loaded feminine characteristic selected was "eager to soothe hurt feelings," instead of another highly loaded feminine characteristic, "affectionate."

In the journalism/mass communication field there are few studies examining instructor sex and gender stereotyping as factors in student evaluations. This is not to say that the subject of student evaluations has not been studied in the journalism/mass communication field (see Hudson, 1989). Yet, this field seems to be an ideal area for such a study for several reasons. Current enrollment trends not withstanding, the journalism/mass communication professional field has traditionally been dominated by males. The exception to this is the employment situation in public relations (U.S. Department of Labor, 1989; AEJMC, 1989). Charting bachelor's degrees granted from 1966 to 1991, Becker and Graf (1995) showed that women are responsible for "the dramatic growth" of communication practitioners in general and journalists in particular (pp. 4-6), but women instructors in journalism/mass communication on the college level remain a minority (Schamber, 1989). Teaching journalism/mass communication also calls for certain characteristics

or talents that are not commonly associated with "feminine behavior." Production classes are technology and equipment intensive. Moreover, classes such as reporting require certain aggressive questioning and other behaviors not associated with feminine stereotypes.

Journalism/mass communication is a field that should be studied discretely. But it is crucial at this time that it be studied in the context of the humanities-based area of communication. Within a context of academic mergers, the trend seems to be to merge schools of journalism and mass communication under umbrella schools of communication. For instance, the Ohio State University merger of their school of journalism with their communication department was occasioned by this trend of resource consolidation. OSU President E. Gordon Gee stated, "It is indeed time for us to revisit past organizational decisions" (Magill, 1994, p. 20). More recently, in 1996, Bowling Green State University, also in Ohio, has merged its School of Mass Communication with Interpersonal Communication.

Methodology

With the prevailing climate of mergers in mind, researchers examined a midwest university that already has incorporated journalism/mass communication courses into its communication school. In addition to journalism/mass communication courses, the school houses interpersonal, organizational, public relations, rhetoric and speech courses. The undergraduate program is divided into two major subject areas of study, with one area being journalism/mass communication and the other area encompassing speech to organizational communication. Because of its business orientation, public relations in this school is grouped within this second

communication subject area. The school also offers a Master of Arts. Although on the graduate level these two areas are less formally defined, students nonetheless choose to concentrate in mass communication or communication. The structure of this school represents one way such a consolidation may be modeled. In general ways it adheres to the national definition of "communications," which has included journalism since 1971 and mass communications since 1983, and also includes public relations (Becker & Graf, 1995, p. 5). However, this school also houses speech and rhetoric, which the Department of Education does not consider under the umbrella of communications (p. 5). Working from within the larger communication context, this study was designed to further the research on student reactions to the sex of the instructor, student perceptions of the instructor's gender and the effect these perceptions have on course evaluations in journalism/mass communication.

To gauge the effect of gender on student evaluation ratings, one of the most widely known and accepted instruments (Cook, 1985, pp. 40-41), the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI), was used as the basis for this study's instrument. This study used the 15-item instrument that the researchers developed in their previous studies. For this study, the 15-item BSRI instrument was imbedded in a 154-item course evaluation questionnaire. Piggy-backing their instrument enabled researchers to reach a larger population and more variety of classes throughout the school of communication than would have been otherwise possible. Using this method, researchers were also able to compare the BSRI results with student responses on a standardized

evaluation. Nine full-time instructors -- five journalism/mass communication and four communication; six male and three female -- volunteered their classes for administration of the questionnaire. Women taught four of the journalism/mass communication courses and two of the communication courses.

The questionnaire was administered to students in 18 classes. Nine of the courses were communication classes, including Communication Theories and Organizational Communication. Seven of the courses were journalism/mass communication courses, including Survey of Mass Communication, Editing and Theories of Mass Communication. Two of the courses were quantitative research methods courses that crossed into both areas. Data from the two research methods courses were not included when the courses were broken out by area. Sixteen of the courses were undergraduate and two of them graduate courses. Class enrollment rosters showed a potential total student population of 458. On the questionnaire, students provided demographic information, including sex and major area of study. Instructors were indicated by sex, and their course by area type. Researchers administered the questionnaire to students present in each class on a voluntary and confidential basis within a two-week time span in the middle of the Spring 1995 semester. The instructor was not present when the students filled out the questionnaire.

Each student was asked to respond on the Likert scale as to his or her degree of agreement with each of the statements, with "1" indicating the highest degree of agreement. The majority of the 154 items, or 131 of them, had been selected from the standardized Iowa evaluation, a widely used and well tested evaluation instrument. The

15-item BSRI was included with five of the items defined as feminine and five as masculine, according to Bem; the other five were filler questions. Remaining items were for student demographics and codes to identify the course. The students coded their responses on computerized answer sheets.

The following hypotheses were tested:

1. Male students will rate male instructors more favorably than female instructors on the standardized evaluation.

2. Female students will rate female instructors more favorably than the male instructors on the standard evaluation.

3. Female journalism/mass communication instructors will be rated higher on the BSRI masculine scale than female communication instructors.

4. Female communication instructors will be rated higher on the BSRI femininity index than the female journalism/mass communication instructors.

5. Female instructors will be rated higher than male instructors on the standardized evaluation.

Answer sheets were entered into the computer, and 328 cases were analyzed using SPSS. Analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were used to test the hypotheses for the relationships among the independent and dependent variables. The independent variables were instructor sex, student sex and class type (journalism/mass communication or communication). Numerical values for masculinity and femininity traits were summed to create BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity indexes,

which were created from the BSRI's desirable masculine and feminine traits as the researchers had done in their previous studies.

The BSRI indexes were used as dependent variables. In other ANOVAs, the dependent variable was the selected-item Iowa standardized evaluation. This version of this standardized evaluation was highly reliable, with Cronbach's Alpha = .9895.

A limitation of this study was that the instructor sample did not allow for control of some instructor variables, such as experience and tenure, or the further class breakdown, such as size and specific type, which have proven meaningful in past studies.

Results

The description of the student population was taken from the students' self described demographic data on the questionnaire (see Table 1).

Of the 319 students who reported their sex, 244 were male and 75 female. Of the 165 students who designated their majors within communication areas, 133 of them stated that they were in the area of journalism/mass communication and 32 indicated that they were majoring in communication. Graduate students were totaled with "other."

Of the 165 undergraduates who reported both their sex and major, 107 of the males and 26 of the females stated their major area as journalism/mass communication; 28 of the males and four of the females designated communication as their major.

Table 1

Student Population Described by Sex and Major

	MAJOR		
	Communication	Mass Communication	Row
SEX			
Male			
Count:	28	107	135
Row %:	20.7	79.3	81.8
Col. %:	87.5	80.5	
Total%:	17.0	64.8	
Female			
Count:	4	26	30
Row %:	13.3	86.7	18.2
Col. %:	12.5	19.5	
Total%:	2.4	15.8	
Column:	32	133 =	165
Total	19.4	80.6 =	100.0%

Number of missing observations: 163

In order to test H1. "Male students will rate male instructors more favorably than female instructors on the standardized evaluation," and H2. "Female students will rate female instructors more favorably than the male instructors on the standard evaluation," the interaction effect for instructor sex and student sex was evaluated. H1 and H2 were not supported.

An ANOVA performed on the data using the standardized evaluation as the dependent variable with instructor sex by student sex by type of course resulted in a 2x2x2 factorial design that showed that the two-way interaction effect for instructor sex and student sex was

not significant (see Table 2). Therefore, H1 and H2 were not supported. This indicated that there was no interaction between same-sex instructors and students.

Table 2

Analysis of Variance: Standardized Evaluation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Squares	F	Sig of F
Main Effects	196505.917	3	65501.972	10.138	.000
Instructor sex	183749.671	1	183749.671	28.439	.000
Student sex	9819.721	1	9819.721	1.520	.219
Type of course	2936.524	1	2936.524	.454	.501
Two-Way Interactions	98548.321	3	32849.440	5.084	.002
Instructor sex and Student sex	6206.195	1	6206.195	.961	.328
Instructor sex and Type of course	73718.287	1	73718.287	11.409	.001
Student sex and Type of course	14654.217	1	14654.217	2.268	.133
3-Way Interactions	4.740	1	4.740	.001	.978
Instructor sex and Student sex and Type of course	4.740	1	4.740.	.001	.978
Explained	295058.978	7	42151.283	6.524	.000
Residual	1770352.657	274	6461.141		
Total	2065411.635	281	7350.219		

Cases processed: 328

Cases missing: 46 (14.0%)

With journalism/mass communication a traditionally male-identified field demanding masculine behaviors, the researchers proposed H3. "Female journalism/mass communication instructors will be rated higher on the BSRI masculine scale than female communication instructors." This hypothesis was not supported.

Table 3

Analysis of Variance: Masculinity Index

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Squares	F	Sig of F
Main Effects	127.138	3	42.379	3.667	.013
Student sex	3.324	1	3.324	.288	.592
Type of course	6.927	1	6.927	.599	.439
Instructor sex	116.887	1	116.887	10.114	.002
Two-Way Interactions	32.402	3	10.801	.935	.424
Student sex and Type of course	8.718	1	8.718	.754	.386
Student sex and Instructor sex	1.616	1	1.616	.140	.709
Type of course and Instructor sex	19.136	1	19.136	1.656	.199
3-Way Interactions	9.504	1	9.504	.822	.365
Student sex and Type of course and Instructor sex	9.504	1	9.504	.822	.365
Explained	169.044	7	24.149	2.090	.045
Residual	3155.134	273	11.557		
Total	3324.178	280	11.872		

Cases processed: 328
Cases missing: 47 (14.3%)

The three-way ANOVA with the BSRI masculinity index as dependent variable and student sex, type of class and instructor sex as independent variables showed a significant difference for instructor sex; however, a significant difference was not found for type of class (see Table 3).

With the cell mean of 11.53, the female instructors as a whole ranked significantly higher on the BSRI masculinity index than did the male instructors, whose mean was 12.96 (lower score = higher rating). Females ranked higher than males on the masculinity scale, but when further differentiated by type of course, communication ranked slightly higher than mass communication instructors (see Table 4).

Table 4

Cell Means on BSRI Masculinity Index: Instructor Sex by Course Type

	INSTRUCTOR SEX	
	Male	Female
COURSE TYPE		
Mass Comm	12.84	11.87
Communication	12.99	11.00

Although there is not necessarily an inverse relationship between masculine and feminine indexes on the BSRI, because of the hypothesized tendency for female journalism/mass communication to favor masculine behaviors, researchers proposed H4. In other words, it was expected that female journalism/mass communication instructors would embody some of the male-defined attributes of their traditionally male profession, and that this would not be the case with female communication instructors. H4: "Female communication instructors will be rated higher on the BSRI femininity index than the female journalism/mass communication instructors." Although the cell means support this hypothesis (see Table 6), there was not a significant difference between type of class on the BSRI femininity index (see Table 5). This hypothesis was not supported.

Using the BSRI femininity index as the dependent variable, the main effect was only significant for instructor sex. The female instructors ranked "higher" on this BSRI index as well. But the main effect for instructor sex and type of class was not significant (see Table 5). With a cell mean of 10.36 for the female instructors and a mean of 12.92 for the male instructors, female instructors as a whole ranked higher on the femininity index.

Table 5

Analysis of Variance: Femininity Index

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Squares	F	Sig of F
Main Effects	409.005	3	136.335	9.914	.000
Student sex	20.150	1	20.150	1.465	.227
Type of course	19.370	1	19.370	1.409	.236
Instructor sex	369.484	1	369.484	26.869	.000
Two-Way Interactions	180.392	3	60.131	4.373	.005
Student sex and Type of course	49.165	1	49.165	3.575	.060
Student sex and Instructor sex	.813	1	.813	.059	.808
Type of course and Instructor sex	136.550	1	136.550	9.930	.002
3-Way Interactions	8.389	1	8.389	.610	.435
Student sex and Type of course and Instructor sex	8.389	1	8.389	.610	.435
Explained	597.786	7	85.398	6.210	.000
Residual	3754.100	273	13.751		
Total	4351.886	280	15.542		

Cases processed: 328
Cases missing: 47 (14.3%)

The female instructors as a whole were rated more feminine than the male instructors, with the female journalism/mass communication instructors second in the ranking, but not significantly differentiated from the higher rating (see Tables 5 & 6).

Table 6

Cell Means on BSRI Femininity Index: Instructor Sex by Course Type

	INSTRUCTOR SEX	
	Male	Female
COURSE TYPE		
Mass Comm	12.39	11.20
Communication	13.05	9.03

Since researchers would not be able to match instructors for variables such as experience, they proposed H5. "Female instructors will be rated higher than male instructors on the standardized evaluation." This hypothesis was supported.

The three-way ANOVA with the standardized evaluation as dependent variable and instructor sex by student sex by type of class showed a significant main effect for instructor sex (see Table 2). On the standardized evaluation, female communication instructors received best ratings and male communication instructors the worst evaluations, with journalism/mass communication instructors falling between, females ranking higher than the males (see Table 7).

Table 7

Cell Means on Standardized Evaluation: Instructor Sex by Course Type

	TYPE OF COURSE	
	Mass Communication	Communication
INSTRUCTOR SEX		
Male	294.62	313.29
Female	271.63	227.15

An interaction effect was revealed, but it was not the anticipated same-sex interaction. The interaction effect was a two-way interaction effect observed between instructor sex and type of class on both the three-way ANOVA using standardized evaluation as dependent variable (see Table 2). A two-way interaction effect was also observed in the ANOVA using the BSRI femininity index as the dependent variable (see Table 5); in other words, there was a significant difference by type of

course and instructor sex when designating degree of adherence to desirable feminine characteristics.

Discussion

Attempts to chart an interaction effect that previous studies suggested between instructor sex and student sex were foiled. Researchers found no significant interaction effect between same-sex instructors and students in the aggregate. However, since the student population became overwhelmingly male in this broader context, female instructors did not suffer adverse effects by an observed lack of interaction effect, or same-sex favorable ratings between student and instructor. With 244 of the 319 students who reporting their sex being male, males dominated the sample in this study. When variables are controlled for, an interaction effect could be revealed, with the female instructors being at a disadvantage in the evaluation process.

Traditional ranking was discovered. Females who rated high on the BSRI femininity index as well as the masculinity index also ranked high on the standardized evaluation. In fact, all three indexes exhibited the same high-to-low ranking of instructors: female communication, female journalism/mass communication, male journalism/mass communication, male communication. In its support for the last hypothesis, this study bore out what the literature predicted, in that when instructor variables such as experience are not controlled for, females are often ranked higher than males on standardized course evaluations.

Two-way interaction effects were observed between instructor sex and course type on both the ANOVA using the standardized

evaluation as dependent variable and the ANOVA using the BSRI femininity index as dependent variable. In the journalism/mass communication courses, female instructors were ranked higher than the male instructors. In communication courses, the same ranking was observed. The females seem to have been rewarded for their high adherence to desirable feminine characteristics (when paired with high ratings on the masculinity index and when instructor factors remain uncontrolled).

With regard to major designation, this study's reported student population differs from the school's reported student body. With 133 of the 165 students who reported their major area of concentration being journalism/mass communication, journalism/mass communication majors dominated the population in this study. However, these major designations are not apparent in the formalized processing and reporting in the school of communication. A Spring 1996 count of those students enrolled in the school of communication who had actually signed contracts designating tracks, revealed 345 in communication areas and 215 in journalism/mass communication areas.

Conclusions and Further Research

The dust has settled at this midwestern university, and some of the results are rather unsettling. Unanticipated results caught the attention of the researchers and beg further study. With 244 of the 319 reporting their sex as male, males dominated the sample in this

study. Can this overwhelming majority of males in the classroom be attributed simply to the broadening of the field, or does it portend a reversal in enrollment trends? In either case, it is an unusual situation for journalism/mass communication educators, particularly women, to find themselves in. When factors such as instructor experience are controlled for, literature indicates that an interaction effect would be anticipated. In such cases, women instructors would be at a disadvantage in the evaluation process. Therefore, building gender-based alliances across the communication disciplines seems to be a healthy strategy in this consolidation climate, and a step that AEJMC President Shoemaker is already taking.

Results seem to indicate that female communication and female journalism/mass communication educators share commonalties, which could provide the foundation for important gender-based alliances. Mergers with communication provide opportunities for journalism/mass communication instructors to build such alliances.

For women just now finding satisfaction within journalism/mass communication, particularly in the recent opportunities to mentor women students, the consequences of this study could be unsettling. It still appears that women educators must fulfill gender androgyny -- perceptions of traditional femininity in order to be accepted and perceptions of traditional masculinity in order to be considered competent in their highly technical field.

With the important implications for journalism and mass communication education that this research suggests, this study calls for more studies to be done in the area of gender-based evaluation research, controlling for instructor rank and experience as well as

student demographics such as age and GPA and the courses by size and type (i.e., production or lecture). The researchers would also like to encourage more studies on student expectations of women instructors in the humanities-based field of communication, to see if they contrast with those expectations held in journalism/mass communication.

In addition to quantitative studies to help chart these phenomena, qualitative methods are also called for in order to explore the questions this study raises.

References

Arreola, R.A. (1984). Defining and evaluating the elements of teaching. Proceedings of Academic Chairpersons: Evaluating Faculty, Students, and Programs, 1 - 14.

Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. (1989). Women, Men and Media: Next Steps for Journalism and Mass Communication Educators, special report.

Basow, S.A. (1992). Gender Stereotypes and Roles, Third Edition. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Basow, S.A. (1995). Student evaluations of college professors: When gender matters. Journal of Educational Psychology, 87, (4), 656-665.

Basow, S.A. & Silberg, N.T. (1987). Student evaluations of college professors: Are female and male professors rated differently? Journal of Educational Psychology, 79, 308-314.

Becker, L.B. & Graf, J.D. (1995) Myths & trends. (special report) Arlington, VA: The Freedom Forum.

Bem, S.L. (1981). Bem Sex-Role Inventory: Professional Manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press Inc. This manual explains the newer, shorter form and elaborates on the original Bem Sex-Role Inventory, initially published in the Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology.

Bernard, M.E., Keefauver, L.W., Elsworth, G. & Naylor, F.D. (1981). Sex-Role behavior and gender in the teacher-student evaluations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 73, 681-695.

Bennett, S. (1982.) Student perceptions and expectations for male and female instructors: Evidence relating to the question of gender bias in teaching evaluation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, 170-179.

Cashin, W.E. (1988). Idea paper no. 20: Student ratings of teaching: A summary of the research. Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, Manhattan, KS: KS State U.

Cashin, W.E. (1989). Idea paper no. 21: Defining and evaluating college teaching. Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, Manhattan, KS: KS State U.

Cashin, W.E. (1990). Idea paper no. 22: Student ratings of teaching: Recommendations for use. Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, Manhattan, KS: KS State U.

Centra, J.A. (1977). How universities evaluate performance: A survey of department heads. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Cook, E.P. (1985). Psychological Androgyny. New York: Pergamon Press.

Cooper, P.J., Stewart, L.P. & Gudykunst, W.B. (1982.) Relationship with instructor and other variables influencing student evaluations of instruction. Communication Quarterly, 30, 308-315.

Elmore, P.B. and La Pointe, K.A. (1974). Effects of teaching sex and the evaluation of college instructors. Journal of Educational Psychology, 66, 386-389.

Fandt, P.M. & Stevens, G.E. (1991) Evaluation bias in the business classroom: Evidence relating to the effects of previous experiences. The Journal of Psychology, 125(4), 469-477.

Feldman, K.A. (1986). The perceived instructional effectiveness of college teachers as related to their personality and attitudinal

characteristics: A review and synthesis. Research in Higher Education. 24, 129-213.

Feldman, K.A.. (1983). Seniority and experience of college teachers as related to evaluations they receive from students. Research in Higher Education, 18, 3-124.

Feldman, K. (1993). College students' views of male and female college teachers: Part II -- evidence from students' evaluations of their classroom teachers. Research in Higher Education, 34, 151-211.

Freeman, H.R. (1994). Student evaluations of college instructors: Effects of type of course taught, instructor gender and gender role, and student gender. Journal of Educational Psychology, 86, (4), 627-630.

Hudson, J.C. (1989). Expected grades correlate with evaluation of teaching. Journalism Educator, 44, 38-44.

Kierstead, D, D'Agnostino, P. & Dill, H. (1988). Sex role stereotyping of college professors: Bias in student ratings of instructors. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80, 342-344.

Lombardo, J. & Tocci, M.E. (1979). Attribution of positive and negative characteristics of instructors. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 48.

Lueck, T.L., Endres, K.L. & Caplan, R.E. (1994). The effect of gender on course evaluations in mass communications: A pilot study. Ecquid Novi, 15 (2), 2-19.

Lueck, T.L., Endres, K.L. & Caplan, R.E. (1993) The interaction effects of gender on teaching evaluations. Journalism Educator, 48 (3), 46-54.

Magill, S.H. (1994, March). Ohio's new land grant university. Ohio State Alumni Magazine, 19-21.

Marsh, H.W. (1984). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases and Uuility. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 707-754.

Marsh, H.W. & Ware, J.E. (1982). Effects of expressiveness, content coverage and incentive on multidimensional student rating scales: New interpretations of the Dr. Fox effect. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, 1126-1134.

Martin, H.J. & Ramanaiah, N.V. (1988). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Psychology Reports, 62, 343-350.

Naftulin, D.H., Ware, J.E.& Donolly, F.A. (1973). The Doctor Fox lecture: A paradigm of educational seduction. Journal of Medical Education, 48, 630-654.

Schamber, L. (1989). Women in mass communication education: Who is teaching tommorrow's communicators? In P.J. Creedon (Ed.), Women in Mass Communication: Challenging Gender Values. Newbury Park, CA: Sage: 148.

Schmitt, B.H. & Millard, R.T. (1988). Construct validity of the "Bem sex role inventory" (BSRI): Does the BSRI distinguish between gender-schematic and gender-aschematic individuals? Sex-Roles, 19, 581-588.

Shoemaker, P.J. (1996, January). From the president. AEJMC News. Association for Education in Journalism & Mass Communication, 2.

Spence, J.T. (1991). Do the BSRI and PAQ measure the same or different concepts? Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15, 141-165.

Stimpson, D., Neff, W., Jensen, L.C. & Newby, T. (1991). The caring morality and gender differences. Psychological Reports, 69, 407-414.

Street, S. Kromrey, J.D. & Kimmel, E. (1995). University faculty gender roles perceptions. Sex Roles, 32, (5/6), 407-422.

Swim, J., Borgida, E., Maruyama, G. & Myers, D.G. (1989). Joan McKay versus John McKay: Do gender stereotypes bias evaluations? Psychological Bulletin, 105 (5), 409-429.

U.S. Department of Labor. (1988). Labor force statistics derived from the current population survey, 1948-87. Bulletin 2307. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wilson, D. & Wilson, K.G., Jr. (1976). Student ratings of instruction. Journal of Higher Education, 47, 465-470.

Yanico, B. (1985). BSRI scores: Stability over four years for college women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9, 277-283.